

## REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-36 were pending in the application. Claims 10, 19, and 32 have been amended. Claims 1-9 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 37-39 have been added.

Claim 32 has been amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9-16, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kikinis (U.S. Patent No. 6,055,566; hereinafter, "Kikinis"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Note that Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Kikinis.

Claims 1-6, and 9 have been canceled without prejudice, thus, obviating the rejection.

Claim 10 as amended sets forth automatically sending the digital data from the computer to a **television** using a wireless data transceiver and manipulating the digital data on the television from a portable electronic device. In contrast, Kikinis fails to disclose the above limitations. The system in Kikinis does not include a television. According to Kikinis, the system may include a *TV station* as a *source* of information (Kikinis, col. 3, lines 24-30; Figure 1, reference numerals 109a-109c). Information may be transferred from the TV station to the server 120 (Kikinis, col. 3, lines 30-32; Figure 1, reference numerals 109a-109c, and 120). But Kikinis does not disclose sending digital data *from a computer to a television*. Moreover, the playback device 110 in Kikinis merely interacts with the PC 123, not with any television (Kikinis, col. 5, lines 41-65; Figure 1, reference numerals 110 and 123). Kikinis fails to disclose that a portable electronic device to manipulate digital data on a television. Therefore, Kikinis fails to anticipate

claim 10 for at least the above reasons. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-14, and 16 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 10. Therefore, Kikinis fails to anticipate claims 11-14, and 16 for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10, Kikinis fails to anticipate claim 19. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 20-33 and 35-36 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Macrae (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,145; hereinafter, "Macrae"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections. Note that Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Macrae.

Claim 20 sets forth automatically obtaining and transferring digital data **based on user specified preferences** from a wide area network to a computer. In contrast, Macrae fails to disclose, at least, the above limitation. The system in Macrae uses a central information broadcasting computer 10 to periodically transmit scheduling, miscellaneous, and system information over a wide area network (WAN) to pager terminals 18. The pager terminals broadcast the information to user locations. (Macrae, col. 4, lines 21-34 and 55-60; Figure 1). Macrae does not disclose, suggest, or imply that the information is transmitted over the WAN based on user specified preferences. Since Macrae fails to disclose at least the above limitation in claim 20, Macrae does not anticipate claim 20. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 21-25 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 20. Therefore, Macrae does not anticipate claims 21-25 for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 20. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-33 and 35-36 are not anticipated by Macrae for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 20. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 7 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Evans et al. (U.S. 6,650,889; hereinafter, "Evans"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 7 has been canceled without prejudice, thus, obviating the rejection. Claim 17 depends from claim 10. Since Evans fails to make up the deficiencies of Kikinis, claim 17 is patentable over Kikinis in view of Evans for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kikinis in view of Macrae. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Claim 8 has been canceled without prejudice, thus, obviating the rejection. Claim 18 depends from claim 10. Since Macrae fails to make up the deficiencies of Kikinis, claim 18 is patentable over Kikinis in view of Macrae for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 10. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Macrae in view of Evans. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.


Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections have been overcome by the amendments and the remarks and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that claims 10-14, and 16-36 as amended are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

New claims 37-39 have been added without introducing any new matter. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 37-39 are novel and unobvious over the references cited. Allowance of the new claims 37-39 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.


Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 7/19, 2004

  
Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with  
sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to the  
Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA  
22313-1450 on July 19, 2004.

  
Esther L. Campbell

7-19-04

Date